



Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

# Indiana State Board of Education Business Meeting

September 4, 2013 9:00 a.m.

Indiana Government Center South – Conference Room A 402 West Washington Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Board members Superintendent Glenda Ritz, Mr. Troy Albert, Mr. Dan Elsener, Dr. David Freitas, Ms. Andrea Neal, Ms. Sarah O'Brien, Dr. Brad Oliver, Mr. David Shane, Mr. Tony Walker, Mr. BJ Watts, and Ms. Cari Whicker were present.

After the Pledge of Allegiance, upon a motion by Mr. Watts, seconded by Ms. O'Brien, and on a voice vote of the present members, the minutes from the August 7, 2013 Board meeting were approved with an amendment, as Mr. Shane was not listed as present in the draft minutes.

**Statement from the Chair**: Superintendent Ritz noted that the order of the discussion and action items would be changed for the meeting, so as to ease the presentation flow for the meeting. She also provided the Board with an update on newly issued 2013 IREAD-3 data which reflected a passage rate of 91.1% and an increase from 2012, and Hoosier Family of Readers. The Board had not received an embargoed report of IREAD-3 data prior to its release to the public. Superintendent Ritz updated the Board on the routine monitoring process that had recently been completed with the US Department of Education on the ESEA Flexibility Waiver, noting that monitoring B had just taken place and the IDOE did not yet know the outcome.

Board Member Comments and Reports: Mr. Elsener celebrated successes in education over the past several years, including improved IREAD3 scores, an increase in graduation rates and the number of students taking ACT and SAT exams, and a significant increase in the number of students taking AP exams. He invited Board members to join him in congratulating educators across the state for these improvements and join him in signing the letter if they wished; he stated that he would share the achievements with newspapers across the state. With the exception of Superintendent Ritz, all Board members signed the letter congratulating Indiana educators on their outstanding accomplishments. Mr. Elsener also offered a resolution on strategic planning, creating a strategic planning committee made up of Superintendent Ritz, Dr. Freitas, Dr. Oliver, Ms. O'Brien, Mr. Watts and Mr. Elsener, that would begin the process of creating a 3year strategic plan for the State Board of Education to develop clear goals, measurable outcomes, and a strategy to achieve those objectives. Mr. Elsener explained the resolution was a follow-up to two separate discussions by Members at the July and August Board meeting regarding the need to create a strategic plan for the Board to provide clear goals and metrics for schools and educators. There was a motion and second in favor of the resolution. Superintendent Ritz made comment that the resolution was not brought forth according to procedure, but she would allow the





Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

vote. The resolution was approved on an affirmative voice vote of the Members; Superintendent Ritz abstained.

Mr. Shane spoke to the need for proactive and transparent communication to the field, so that those who are teaching our children understand the issues facing the state, specifically the ESEA Flexibility Waiver and the Common Core State Standards. He also noted that while he has no concerns regarding the strategic planning committee, the key is being open. He also expressed the importance of quick and clear communication between the Board members, Board staff and the IDOE and the need to keep communication substantive and about kids.

Ms. Neal offered comments on the proposed Social Studies Standards. She noted that the current standards are strong, and have been rated an A- by the Fordham Institute. She expressed concern for removing the specific examples from the proposed standards. She explained that Mr. Blomberg from IDOE told her that the examples are now in a supplemental resource rather than being directly noted in the standards themselves. Ms. Neal wants to ensure that detail and objectivity are priority in the creation of the new standards. She recommended that Fordham conduct a full side-by-side comparison of the proposed and current standards prior to adoption to ensure the strength of the standards. Superintendent Ritz indicated outside entities are not a part of Indiana's standards process. Mr. Shane and Mr. Elsener clarified that third party reviews have been done in the past for various subjects to ensure they were clear and that no gaps were present within the standards being proposed Superintendent Ritz did not address the request to have a third party review Indiana's proposed social studies standards. Ms. Neal also commented that she hoped the Board could better accommodate members of the public who come to speak.

Mr. Walker discussed the need to change the compulsory age of attendance for students in the state. He expressed the need for students to be in school no later than age 6 and requested a partnership with the General Assembly and the Governor to address the issue.. Superintendent Ritz agreed with Mr. Walker's comments and indicated that early childhood education is going to be on the IDOE's legislative agenda.

Dr. Oliver requested information related to ISTEP+. Ms. Whicker indicated she believes she is not receiving all pertinent communications. Superintendent Ritz explained that all information goes out to the field via the DOE Dialogue and Board members should make sure they are signed up for that email communication.

**Public General Comments**: Ms. Mary Ann Schlegel Ruegger offered public comment regarding issues her daughter experienced with the questions on the IREAD-3 exam from two years prior.

Dr. Bonnie Fisher from the Global Education Reform Watch, Inc. offered comment to the Board on the importance of strong standards for Indiana students, noting that standards from decades past were stronger than those in place in today's classrooms. She expressed overall concern with schools focusing too much on college and career readiness and not on knowledge acquisition.

Ms. Jenny Robinson offered comment opposing IREAD-3, and presented the Board with a petition opposing IREAD-3 that was collected but not presented to the Board during the time of the promulgation of the rule.





Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

She expressed concern regarding the climate of high stakes testing. Mr. Elsener noted that interim assessments like NWEA are determined at the local level and not mandated by the state. Dr. Oliver clarified that the Board had merely tabled the IREAD-3 discussion in July and asked for a more robust conversation and review. He also said the Board has asked for the reading rule to be placed back on the agenda, but it has not yet been added. Superintendent Ritz stated it would be part of a larger assessment conversation at a later time per prior comments she has made.

Mr. Hap Hazzard from the Hazzard Institute discussed inequity in state funding for charter schools in Indiana, particularly in facility and transportation costs. He expressed the need for equal access to resources since charters are equally accountable for performance.

Best Practices-Innovations in Education – Student Successes: Assistant Superintendent for Outreach, Ms. Teresa Brown, and Director of Outreach, Mr. Leroy Robinson, presented to the Board the IDOE's Outreach Division for School Improvement. They highlighted the newly formed Division and the new ways in which the Division will provide resources and school improvement oversight to schools across the state. 13 Regional Outreach Coordinators will be working out of the 9 regional Education Service Centers to foster relationships with community partners and schools; assist with professional development; provide technical assistance to LEAs and schools; offer additional supports to focus and priority schools; and assist with monitoring federal school improvement grants. Focus and Priority schools will be visited by the Outreach Coordinators several times during the school year to monitor school improvement plans, review data and document progress. Outreach Coordinators will also serve as a bridge between IDOE staff and schools across the state. Mr. Elsener asked what are the goals, objectives and metrics for the Outreach Division. Ms. Brown replied that IDOE will be working with a University to evaluate the Outreach program. Ms. Whicker stated that she would like to see some baseline data and goals for the Outreach Division. Dr. Freitas requested a compilation of best practices to share the great work going on across Indiana. Ms. Brown indicated it would be created. Ms. O'Brien asked for a list of all priority and focus schools by region for the Board, including an updated list whenever it is revised. Ms. Brown indicated it would be provided.

**Discussion:** Dr. Peggy Hinckley, Interim Superintendent of IPS, discussed the Lead Partners and their work with the IPS schools. She noted IPS's desire to step forward and contribute to their progress, and as such they have contracted directly with the Lead Partners. She noted success with three of the Lead Partners in the past year: Scholastic, TNTP, and Voyager. Dr. Hinckley noted that scores at George Washington, who was partnered with Amplify and TNTP, had declined and that there is concern for the school letter grade dropping from a C to a D. Dr. Hinckley expressed a continued commitment from IPS for improvement in the schools that have been assigned Lead Partners.

Mr. Ian Scott from TNTP presented to the Board on the progress made during the last year at Broad Ripple and George Washington High Schools. TNTP was initially contracted to work with both high schools to increase teacher effectiveness and provide support with the teacher evaluation tools. They presented the objectives that were established at the onset of the Lead Partner relationship, and noted that the five objectives for the 2011-2012 school year had been met. TNTP explained they were not asked by IDOE to provide a proposal to continue its work at George Washington for the 2013-14 school year, and the request for a final proposal for





Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

Broad Ripple had only been received the previous week. Mr. Shane stated that the Board had voted to continue all Lead Partner interventions at the same level. During the upcoming school year at Broad Ripple, TNPT will focus on two main priorities aimed at building the leadership team's capacity to utilize systems and tools that help teachers improve. TNTP explained plans to work with the school to set end-of-year goals that build on the successes from the previous year's supports. They indicated that while the funds are significantly less than previously planned, they have adjusted resources and onsite time to ensure they maximize their resources to keep the initiative moving forward to obtain positive results for the school. TNTP's objective is to plan for a gradual release model so that the school is self-sustaining at the end of this year's contract. IDOE stated that TNTP will not be working with George Washington in the coming school year, as there are no federal funds remaining to support a Lead Partner initiative at George Washington. Mr. Shane clarified that Lead Partner schools are classified under Indiana law as Turnaround Academies, in which case the Board can direct the IDOE to allocate both federal and state funds toward any Lead Partner interventions.

Mr. Duncan Young from Scholastic presented to the Board on the partnership with Broad Ripple Magnet High School. Scholastic is beginning their third year working with Broad Ripple and improvement data was provided via power point. Mr. Young noted the goals that have been established with this partnership and identified which goals were met to date. He addressed plans for the upcoming school year, which include gradual release so that when the year ends, the gains that have been made will continue in the school. Mr. Young explained that for the school to sustain their improvements and growth, the school will need to ensure they have established a critical mass as well as a leadership team beyond one person who is solely responsible for the school. Scholastic has expanded professional learning for teachers, so that every teacher will be fully equipped with the needed tools to go forward. Scholastic highlighted measurable results of this partnership, noting an improvement in the school accountability grades at both the middle school and high school, improved ECA and ISTEP+ scores, increased student and staff attendance and decreased suspension rates. Dr. Oliver asked for follow up from the IDOE related to the gradual release model and how IDOE will continue to monitor the school once this initiative has ended.

Ms. Judy Zimny of Voyager presented the work that they have done at John Marshall Community High School, and noted that the 2012-2013 school year was the first year that they worked with the school. Voyager stated that one of the major challenges at John Marshall has been the amount of change at the school. Within the last three years there have been three different partners at the school, , a change in school leadership (including a shift to a co-principal structure versus a single principal), and 50% staff turnover over the past three years. Voyager presented improved measurable goals including a decrease in students graduating with waivers and improved ECA passing rates in Algebra I, and improved College and Career Readiness indexes. The English 10 passing rate remained steady, and will be a focus for the 2013-2014 school year. During the 2013-2014 school year, Voyager noted clear goals that have been set for graduation rates, ISTEP+/ECA passing rates, College and Career Readiness, as well as a plan that allows for a transition of ownership of the goals and work to the school for continued success. Voyager also noted that the amount of involvement at John Marshall will be abuot half of what it was last year; both the size of the team and the number of days of support at the school. When asked if the level of support would be sufficient, Ms. Zimny noted it would be sufficient only if there was a clean execution and focus on the part of Voyager and the school.





Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

Mr. Dave Stevenson and colleagues from Amplify presented on their work at George Washington High School. They explained their initial goals and scope of work, as well as the difficulties they faced while working with George Washington, including an unanticipated increase in student enrollment of almost 60% and multiple administrative changes. From 2011-2012 to the 2012-2013 school year, English 10 ECA results decreased and there was no improvement in the Algebra I ECA results. Amplify noted their core model revolves around developing professional learning communities, and there was resistance from the teachers in the school, with some teachers preferring a more traditional professional development model. Amplify explained to the Board that IDOE offered them a 3- month extension to their contract in August, but because the intent of the work is long-term sustainability they respectfully declined the offer, noting it would not lead to the type of growth Amplify would ultimately like to see for the school. Mr. Stevenson also noted that he IDOE had notified Amplify in June that its contract would not be renewed. Ms. Whicker stated that it is the Board's responsibility in law to determine interventions. IDOE indicated there are not federal dollars to support George Washington for the 2013-2014 school year so they will not be receiving support from a Lead Partner contract.

Dr. Hinckley spoke to the relationship between George Washington and Amplify, noting the resistance amongst the teachers to the new way that Amplify was offering support, as it was very different from the previously offered supports. She also noted the school had a different intervention in place prior to Amplify, and the staff was not ready to accept a new model at the time Amplify was implemented. Dr. Hinckley Indicated the bottom line for any intervention is student achievement results. Mr. Walker asked Dr. Hinckley whether the Board should end the intervention at George Washington. Dr. Hinckley said no, and stated that the Board has the responsibility for overseeing the intervention and should "keep its thumb on us."

Ms. Danielle Shockey, Deputy Superintendent, presented the monthly reporting template for the Lead Partners and for all schools served by the Outreach Division. The template allows for a combination of all school goals to be outlined from school improvement plans, and federal requirements and frames the goals around the turnaround principles. School data is expected to be part of the support that is provided under each goal.

Ms. Tamra Wright from the Mayor's Office for Education Innovation presented the template created by their office for the Turnaround School Operators for their monthly monitoring. She updated the Board on their office's oversight process for the turnaround operators. Ms. Wright's office will be presenting to the Board on a quarterly basis, and the data in the template will be provided to the Board each month. The template not only shows trends, but also allows for comment from the school and an opportunity to express next steps.

#### **New Business - Action:**

Dr. Peggy Hinckley addressed the status at George Washington High School for the 2013-2014 school year. IPS has a plan to implement the 8 Step Process of improvement strategies to successfully increase student achievement on ECAs. IPS is committed to 3 days of training on the 8 Step Process, and monthly leadership coaching from a principal in Warren Township who is well versed in the 8 Step Process. Pat Davenport will be providing the training for IPS related to the 8 Step Process. IPS has offered their own resources to improve this school and to take ownership of turning the school around. Ms. Shockey explained the IDOE has had conference calls with USDOE and there is no funding available to support the school. Since the IDOE has





Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

indicated they have no federal funds available for a Lead Partner for George Washington, Ms. Shockey presented IDOE's recommendation that IDOE serve as the Lead Partner for George Washington. Board members expressed concern about over-taxing IDOE staff by taking on this level of work at George Washington. The Board also revisited previous conversations at other Board meeting whereby they insisted these schools, at a minimum, maintain the same level of support as previously provided through the Lead Partner contracts, and should under no circumstance be less than what was previously provided to the schools. Mr. Shane questioned the legality of IDOE serving as a Lead Partner and questioned how IDOE would be able to both effectively implement an intervention and also objectively execute their responsibility for monitoring that intervention at the same time. . He suggested that the support provided by Davenport in the 8 Step Process felt more like a Lead Partner relationship and suggested the Board move in that direction. Mr. Walker added that before going in that direction, the Lead Partner intervention needed to be terminated. Ms. O'Brien expressed the need for accountability of the school to not decrease if a Lead Partner obligation is released. Mr. Walker made a motion to terminate the Lead Partner aspect of the intervention at George Washington, the motion was seconded by Dr. Oliver and passed 10-0. Dr. Oliver stated it was still the obligation of the Board to monitor the progress of the school. Ms. Whicker stated she didn't want the Board to be party to letting a school that went from 6 years as an F school to a C and then down to a D, and if it goes down to an F force the Board to wait another 6 years to intervene again. After Board discussion, the IDOE recommendation was changed to implement IPS's plan for school improvement indicating that Davenport would serve as Lead Partner, in collaboration with the Department's support, and maintain George Washington as a Priority school with monthly monitoring reports. Dr. Freitas made a motion to accept the IDOE's recommendation, which was seconded by Ms. O'Brien. The motion passed 10-0.

Ms. Becky Bowman, Director of Special Education for IDOE, presented the final approval of the rule to align 511 IAC 7-40-8 to the new federal regulations. Ms. Bowman noted that there was no public comment provided during the public comment period on this rule. Dr. Oliver made a motion to approve the rule, which was seconded by Mr. Walker. The final approval passed 8-0.

Ms. Bowman then presented the language for the emergency rule for Choice Scholarships for Special Education Students in Nonpublic Schools, as was required in HEA1003. Ms. Bowman noted that after the last Board meeting the stakeholder group reconvened and reached a consensus on the language for the emergency rule. She noted that the point of contention was the complaint process for parents of choice scholarship students, in particular with the IDOE offering corrective action as a result of an investigation into the complaint. Mr. Tebbe from the Indiana Catholic Conference and Mr. John Elcesser from the Indiana Nonpublic Education Association both spoke against the complaint process in the emergency rule and asked the Board to approve their proposed revisions. Mr. Gary Richter from the Indiana Protection and Advocacy Services expressed concerns about the emergency rule. Ms. Joan McCormick from the Indiana Council for Administrators of Special Education (ICASE) spoke in support of the emergency rule and offered ICASE's support in working on the final rule during the rule promulgation process. Dr. Oliver thanked Ms. Bowman and the stakeholders for their additional work on the emergency rule, and made a motion to approve the emergency rule as presented; the motion was seconded by Mr. Albert. Ms. Neal expressed concerns on overregulating choice schools and made a motion to amend the rules with the suggestions requested by the





Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

nonpublic schools. Her motion did not receive a second and the amendment was not taken. A roll call vote was taken on the emergency rule as presented and the rule passed 9-1, with Ms. Neal voting no.

The final action item presented to the Board was approval to initiate rulemaking and proposed amendments to 511 IAC 48, to align the reporting process with the new fiscal year cycle for state tuition support. In the past, the reporting process was aligned to the state tuition support cycle, which was changed during the legislative session. Mr. Walker made a motion to initiate rulemaking and of the proposed amendments, which was seconded by Mr. Albert. The motion passed 10-0.

**Consent Agenda:** The consent agenda was approved on a voice vote, after a motion to approve was made by Mr. Watts and seconded by Mr. Shane. The consent agenda included approval of School Technology Advance Applications, Transfer Tuition Petition resolutions, re-adoption and expiration of rules scheduled to expire on 12/31/13 and approval of governing body plan changes for Southeast Dubois County School Corporations.

Discussion: Glenwood Leadership Academy, part of the Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation (EVSC), presented to the Board on their work related to improving the school. Dr. David Smith, Superintendent, and Carrie Hillyard, Director of School Transformation at EVSC, shared with the Board the practices that have been put in place in EVSC and Glenwood Leadership Academy to take action towards sustainable transformation. They have partnered with Mass Insight Education (MIE), which has provided turnaround expertise and support, which has allowed the district and school to and have adopt a proactive internal Lead Partner strategy.. Early leading indicators from Glenwood were shared with the Board, noting that while school has only been in session for 14 days, there is already improvement in attendance rates, culture and climate staff surveys, and improved school-wide discipline as compared to the same point in time during the previous school year. Justin Cohen from Mass Insight Education spoke to the partnership between MIE and EVSC, noting that the level of commitment from both the individual school and the district toward improving student achievement was outstanding. Mr. Cohen indicated MIE only accepts partnerships where there is willingness from the school/district, and all contracts are performance partnerships and the success is based on student achievement. Superintendent Ritz noted a grade was unable to be assigned to the school at this time because of the elementary piece. Mr. Watts and Superintendent Ritz commended EVSC for embarking on systems change.

Dr. Richard Hill from the The National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment, presented to the Board the results of his review of the interruptions of the ISTEP+ testing that occurred this spring. He noted that there is no way to definitively determine how students would have scored without the interruptions; however, the analysis suggested that the impact of the interruptions on the scores was negligible for a majority of students. This year 95% of students took the test online, which was a 24% increase from the previous year. Dr. Hill noted CTB provided a tremendous amount of data that assisted his study, including the number of interruptions, down to the exact student interrupted, and for how long. He stated that CTB's data analyses were well-conceived, well-designed, and concluded appropriately. As part of Dr. Hill's study, he excluded students who took less either less than a particular time period or longer than a particular time period to complete the test. It was indicated those students' scores would be invalidated. Mr. Albert asked if there was any consideration given to special education students in those exclusions, since often times an





Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

accommodation for students with disabilities is time and a half on a test. Dr. Hill indicated that was not taken into consideration. He provided detailed analysis of the statewide scores by grade over the years. After reviewing the trends of the scores, he found that there was no consistent, discernible effect from the interruptions. It was stated that less than 1% of participating students' scores would be invalidated as a result of the interruptions. Dr. Hill noted he was asked to complete a similar analysis 34 years prior in another state, and the only data was anecdotal. Dr. Hill stated to walk into this situation and for CTB to have so much data readily available was extremely helpful in conducting his analysis. Superintendent Ritz explained to the Board that parents and teachers would be receiving ISTEP+ scores on September 9<sup>th</sup>; disaggregated data would be available September 17, with all remaining data available September 30; and the educator effectiveness function of assigning a 1, 2, 3, or 4 to teachers would be provided October 7.

Due to the length of the meeting, the following discussion items from the agenda were tabled: electronic participation in meetings; presentation on compensation models by IDOE and IEERB; and HEA1005 Remediation Guidelines update.

The next discussion item brought before the Board was the A-F policy discussion. Superintendent Ritz noted that the report issued by the legislature was expected later that week but was not yet available. She explained that for the 2012-2013 grades a rule piece will need to be addressed by the Board. Superintendent Ritz updated the Board on the Accountability System Review Panel that was established by the legislature. The Panel consists of 4 appointments from each the Superintendent, the Governor, the Speaker of the House, and the President of the Senate. Each will appoint one teacher, one principal, one superintendent and a technical advisor. The panel will then bring to the Board their recommendations. Superintendent Ritz noted that it is likely that there will need to be a second meeting in October, to address the school accountability work that must be completed by November 15, 2013 as required in HEA1427.

The last discussion item was the Common Core Standards Review Process. Superintendent Ritz discussed the timeline for the review that had been previously distributed to the Board. She suggested holding the hearings in March, with the standards approved by April so that schools would be aware of all decisions by May. Mr. Shane suggested building a month between when the Education Roundtable reviews the standards and when they are reviewed by the Board, so the Board has sufficient time for review of the proposal before final action must be taken. Ms. Whicker noted that the fiscal report completed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) stated that the sooner the new standards are finalized, the more fiscally responsible the state will be, and as such requested the hearings be held in November. Superintendent Ritz indicated she wants to hold IDOE's regional summits prior to having any hearings, as she wants the summits to be about the standards to get public input regarding revisions. She indicated the Roundtable would meet in February with final approval at the April meeting. Superintendent Ritz stated she wants to make sure everything is doable for schools. Mr. Shane expressed that the newly adopted standards need to be as strong, if not stronger, than the rest of the country and requested a mechanism is included in the process to ensure that is the case. .Superintendent Ritz explained committee members will be appointed by September 10, and higher education would serve on advisory committees and not be part of committee named by September 10. She stated her commitment to getting a vast amount of input from a variety of sources. Superintendent Ritz indicated she would revise the timeline and provide it to Board members.





Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

Mr. Shane indicated he would appreciate clarification on the sources and uses of funds for all Turnaround and Lead Partner interventions and resources. He asked to schedule a meeting with IDOE staff before the next meeting to obtain information related to the specific cost, as well as where the money is coming from, and where it is going. Superintendent Ritz said IDOE staff could do so. Mr. Shane said other members were welcome to join the meeting.

**Board Operations:** The 2014 meeting dates were discussed and were established as follows: January 8, February 5, March 12, April 2, May 14, June 4, July 9, August 6, September 3, October 1, November 5, December 3. Superintendent Ritz indicated an updated calendar of 2014 meetings would be provided to the Board.

Dr. Freitas expressed concern regarding the length of the meetings and ensuring the public is accommodated. He asked that IDOE and SBOE staff collaborate to look at addressing the agenda. He suggested that going forward a lunch break could be included in the agenda, with items clearly scheduled in the morning or the afternoon for the public's benefit.

Board orientation was discussed for October and Superintendent Ritz will suggest proposed dates and distribute to the Board. Ms. Neal requested that if the Board would need to meet twice in October, as previously mentioned by Superintendent Ritz during the meeting, that orientation potentially be held on a Saturday given the impact on work schedules for Board members.

Dr. Freitas offered a resolution regarding staffing, which appointed Anne Davis as SBOE Director, Michelle Gough McKeown as General Counsel and Claire Fiddian-Green as Technical Advisor to the SBOE. The resolution was a follow-up to the July 19 resolution regarding SBOE staffing. The resolution also directed Mr. Elsener to create job descriptions for the Director, General Counsel and Technical Advisor. Superintendent Ritz made comment that the resolution was not brought forth according to procedure, but she would allow the vote. The motion was approved on a vote of 6-1 with Mr. Albert, Dr. Freitas, Ms. Neal, Dr. Oliver, Mr. Shane, Mr. Watts and Ms. Whicker voting in support; Superintendent Ritz voted against the resolution.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:10 pm.